DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 634 HE 017 360

AUTHOR Creamer, Don G.
TITLE Student Development in Urban Commuter Colleges.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; *Commuter Colleges; Higher Education; Individual Development; *Student College Relationship; *Student Development; Student Personnel Services; *Undergraduate Students; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

A conceptual view of student development and the milieu of an urban commuter college are discussed. Student development is defined as the application of human development theory, principles, and concepts in an educational setting to identify the forms of development in students to which the institution is willing and able to commit its resources. It is suggested that student development concepts and practices differ from mainstream, traditional student services. It is also proposed that the urban, commuter college environment, resources, and opportunities for facilitating student development differ sufficiently from other types of college environments to require specialized programming by professionals. Attention is directed to universal developmental concerns of undergraduate students: intellectual development, moral and ethical development, self development, interpersonal development, and career development. Strategies for student development are also suggested in regard to recruitment and intake, advising, teaching, environmental management, developmental programming, and information dissemination. Finally, developmental programming is defined to distinguish it from other types. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245634

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN COMMUTER COLLEGES

by

Don G. Creamer
Associate Professor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Don D. Creamer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 017 360

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN COMMUTER COLLEGES

Don G. Creamer

A conceptual view of student development is presented in this chapter. What is student development? How may it be operationalized for practice? How is it different from other conceptual views of student personnel? What is an urban, commuter college? How does urban education differ from nonurban education? Does this institutional type present any unique opportunities to promote development in students? Answers to these questions vary tremendously depending on the conceptual orientation of the respondent. For example, urbanness is more than geography and student development is more than strategy.

The most common definition of student development in the literature is that offered by Miller and Prince (1976), the thrust of which embodies the concepts and principles of human development in an educational setting. Most authorities do not quarrel with this general definition, but it is very general. For purposes of discussion in this chapter, student development shall be taken to mean the application of human development theory, principles, and concepts, in an educational setting in such manner to identify the forms of development in students to which the institution is willing and able to commit its resources and to target resources in the form of selected strategies

designed intentionally to change student's knowledge, behavior, attitudes, beliefs, or values. This definition is practical, in that it demands a purposeful delimitation of scope and intent in programming, and it is accountable, in that it is targeted and focused on a measurable phenomena--development or change in students. A major premise of this chapter, then, is that student development concepts and practices differ sufficiently from mainstream, traditional student services to merit separate consideration.

Dillon (1980) describes an urban university (not a community college, though some of the characteristics apply to that type) as (a) a campus that is located in a major urban area, (b) possessing a substantial number of students who commute to campus, (c) offering programs that make higher education more accessible to students living in the urban community, (d) commited to urban-oriented education, research, and/or service strategies, (e) including a range of professional schools and/or graduate programs, and (f) accepting a deep sense of responsibility to their urban constituencies and of urgency in the need to cope with their constituencies' problems (p. 37). This definition is comprehensive, but also captures somewhat the meaning of urbanness--a form of bonding between the purposes of the college or university and the needs of the people inhabiting the city, or perhap as Spaights (1980) claims that "The urbanness of a university can be measured by its commitment in dealing with

the problems and needs of its city" (p. 370). Perhaps more than any other institutional type, the urban, commuter college accepts, and in large measure is driven to meet, the needs of the adults in the immediate vicinity.

Special characteristics of institutions need to be recognized explicitly and made to enhance the chosen forms of development in students, not to serve as an excuse to evade responsibility. While commuting, part-time students may appear ellusive and difficult to help, the strong institutional bond between purpose and need may serve to overcome the barrier. Thus, a second major premise of this chapter is that the urban, commuter college environment, resources, and opportunities for facilitating student development differ sufficiently from other types of college environments to require specialized programming by professionals.

The Students and the Institutions

A claim of uniqueness of students in urban, commuter colleges as compared to students enrolled in other types of institutions is difficult to substantiate. A descriptive profile of urban, commuter students would likely vary in many ways from a profile of residential, liberal arts students. But it is unlikely to vary sufficiently to merit the label unique, since it is equally probable that the profiles would overlap or show strong similarities in many ways as well.

Claims in the literature are common that community college student characteristics are unique among institutional types. But, clearly, they are not unique, even by some simple demographic comparison such as age. That community college students, as a group, are older than university students, as a group is seen frequently. Yet, data show that in 1978, the mean age of community college students was 21.5, and the mean age was 21.7 for students at four-year institutions (Hyde, 1980). The problem is one of precision of data comparison, for if only the lower division students of the two institutional types are included, the mean age becomes 25.4 and 20.8 respectively. Even a greater difference is found when the comparisons are differentiated by part- and full-time enrollment. In 1978, for example, mean age of full-time students at two year colleges versus four-year colleges was 21.5 and 21.7 respectively. The same comparisons of part-time student mean ages showed 30.4 and 30.9 respectively (Hyde, 1980). The big difference in age is accounted for by enrollment pattern to a far greater extent than by institutional type.

Additional claims are seen in the literature that urban, commuter institutions serve more nontraditional students as represented by characteristics such as low-income or blue-collar backgrounds, working full- or part-time, or married (Spaights, 1980) than do other types of colleges. Certainly, students in these institutions may be more heterogeneous in ability,

aspiration, cultural background, and interests than in colleges or universities located elsewhere (Dillon, 1980). But the fact remains that, aside from age and sex, these distinctions may have little to do with a developmental analysis of student characteristics.

A developmental profile of students might reveal levels of reasoning, ways of making meaning of reality, cognitive complexity, ego status, identity status, quality of coping skills, quality of relationships, or levels of maturity. Some of these qualities surely are culture related, that is, a person deprived of experience or inculcated by virtue of race or sex, may show slower progress along selected developmental dimensions. Other qualities may be less related to culture, as may be the case in moral and ethical development. But few of these qualities are dictated by the types of descriptors commonly used to compare student characteristics and, in fact, may show only modest positive correlation. Certain developmental qualities of students, then, may be impervious, for all practical purposes, to variation by social or cultural forces. Many are shaped by culture, of course, but they may not be influenced so much by income level, race, or type of job as by attitudes, values, and beliefs arising from family, church, and neighborhood experiences.

The association between types of college experiences and levels and types of development is firmly established (Astin,

1977; Brown, 1972; Chickering, 1974). Without much doubt, the impact on students is measurably greater in residential colleges than in commuter colleges, in four-year colleges than in two-year colleges, and in private colleges than in public ones. Apparently, at least the factors of length and intensity of experience are highly correlated with impact (Astin, 1977). If for no other reason (and certainly there are others), the commuter institution normally is handicapped by its inability to control either factor. By comparison, the two-year college faces an even greater challenge, since many of their students are only tenuously associated with the institution at all. Where the associations are strong, on the other hand, as with perhaps the full-time, degree seeking student, the impact of two-year colleges on student development increases. It is worthy to remember that ability to promote development in students is related to time and quality of experience.

At the same time that urban students' enrollment patterns, as in part-time arrangements, may represent a barrier to the intentional facilitation of development in them, the richness of their experience, coming naturally as it does in a complex, fast-moving, urban environment, may represent an opportunity. This may be especially true along the dimension of moral and ethical development, where progress seems to be related to exposure to competing ideas, values, and ideals. Striving for justice, a goal for institution and student alike (Carnegie Commission,

1972), is intricately woven into the richness of experience of urban life and is inextricably tied to moral and ethical development in students.

Forms of Development

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reported on the assets and liabilities of urban education in 1972 and confronted educators with several findings and recommendations, some of which are especially relevant for this analysis. The Commission found, for example, that "The city provides contact with reality--new ways to learn" (p. 2) but at the same time argued that the campus in the city ". . . cannot do everything everybody wants it to do; some things it cannot do at all" (Carnegie Commission, 1972, p. 3). Likewise, they found that cities vary enormously as do institutions within them. The obvious conclusion seems to be that colleges and universities in urban settings must decide what they can and should do. They must decide, for example, what forms of development in students are reasonable and proper for each institutions and create programs to promote these forms while ignoring or leaving to others forms which are unreasonable or improper in a particular context. It is unfortunate, but probably true, that institutions which try to be all things to all people may be little to anyone.

How is the decision to be made? A human is a beautifully intricate and complex being and it is difficult, or controversial at best, to argue that one aspect is more important to the person

than another. A human's world, likewise, is intricate and complex with each part serving a special role as an interaction agent. Each institution of society must define its role, based on its purposes, its resources, and its constraints. We normally do not expect other institutions of society, such as the church or municipal government, to meet all needs of constituents and we should not expect colleges and universities to meet all developmental needs of their students, even though the "development of students" is a common statement of purpose. The decision, then, must be made by looking at what is possible and desirable within a particular context, with particular realities and constraints, rather than by looking solely at human need. Obviously, informed decisions are indicated. It would be silly to choose for program focus developmental needs normally encountered and mastered before or during early adolescence. Theory and research fortunately provide strong guides for deciding which forms of development are normally in ascendency during certain ages and under certain conditions (Chickering, 1969; Knefelkamp, Widick & Parker, 1978; Kohlberg, 1976; Perry, 1970; Rodgers, 1980). A rational decision then may be made to focus resources on those forms generally requiring, or at least open to or ready for, resolution under the conditions created by college life and during the age ranges normally exhibited by undergraduates. A helpful discussion of modal age distributions of undergraduates is provided by Kasworm (1982).

This posture argues for explicit decisions by representatives of each urban, commuter college regarding the forms of development in students which shall guide their work. This chapter analysis must necessarily be more hypothetical. Without the luxury--or burden--of a particular college milieu to give focus to the choice of developmental forms, a more generalized perspective is necessary. The forms defined below will guide the conceptual analysis for the remainder of the chapter and were selected because (a) they represent certain universal developmental concerns of undergraduate students, and (b) they represent a diversity in dimensions of development.

Intellectual development. Having to do with acquisition and processing of information and knowledge, this form of development represents perhaps the most basic commitment of colleges to their students. In a more technical sense, however, it may be separated into two developmental threads--logical reasoning and concepts of knowledge (Kitchner, 1982). The work of Inhelder and Piaget (1958) and that of Kitchner and King (1981) may serve as useful perspectives to grasp the details of the two dimensions of intellectual development.

Moral and ethical development. While not discrete from the intellectual form, these dimensions represent especially critical concerns for the development of college students. They focus, in part, on values, but most particularly on the forms of reasoning

employed by individuals when faced with a problem. The dimensions of moral reasoning, as theorized by Kohlberg (1976), is a matter of urgent concern of an urban population, concerned as it is with justice in society and with patterns of reasoning so critical to decision making in an extremely complex world. Ways of making meaning of the world, as examined by Perry (1970), represents an equally urgent problem of college students who must understand and ultimately use complex information, ideas, ideals, and values with which they are bombarded during the college years.

Self development. This form of development pertains to a pattern of growth toward increasing awareness of who one really is, or can be, and is represented by increasingly appropriate behaviors consistent with new awareness. It is embodied in a personal preoccupation with questions like, "Who am I?" The work of Erikson (1968) may best amplify this dimension and further helps to understand the meaning of age-related stages, the nature of a developmental environment, and individual coping skills (Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978, p. 13). In a technical sense, this dimension may most commonly be viewed as synonymous with identity development, and certainly identity is a major component, but it is not meant to be limited solely to a singular developmental thread.

Interpersonal development. An extension of the previous dimension, this form pertains to patterns of relating to others.

It is well explained by Chickering (1969) and is characterized by ". . . increased tolerance and acceptance of differences between individuals and increased capacity for mature and intimate relationships" (Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978, p. 24). Whether this form focuses on initial expressions of intimacy with the opposite sex, on interactions between marital partners and with children, or on closeness and trust among friends, colleagues, or neighbors, it represents another personal preoccupation of college students.

Career development. This form is not represented by a single developmental thread. It is a collage of threads which finds expression in work and career. Super (1982) helps to understand the phenomenon as a life time pattern, and Holland (1973) helps grasp the person-environment interaction consequences. Furthering career often is a major reason for students' coming to college and may represent a potent perspective for them as they make sense of curricula and other planned collegiate experiences.

These forms of development, chosen to structure further analysis, represent two forms of cognitive/intellectual development (intellectual and moral and ethical), two forms of psychosocial development (self and interpersonal), and one form which embodies the consequences of growth in the other areas through the expression of work (career).

What are the traditional methods for promoting each form of development? Unfortunately, most forms of intellectual development have been left to classroom instruction, to occur "naturally" or accidently in the hands of professionals concerned mostly with transmission of discipline-based knowledge. While classroom instruction may be an excellent method for promoting intellectual growth, it often is not focused on the developmental aspects of logical reasoning and concepts of knowledge, except as may, and often does, occur unintentionally by the nature of assimilating new knowledge.

Psychosocial forms of development traditionally are promoted in out-of-class activities and/or counseling. Residential environments provide more opportunity for intentional programming for self or interpersonal growth due to the presence of natural settings for student interaction. In commuter settings, or with populations of commuter students in residential settings, other opportunities must be seized, such as through planned activities, advising, and/or counseling. Similarly, career development traditionally is promoted by special programming ordinarily directed by either the professionals in career planning and placement or in counseling. These programs often take the form of career clinics, career information sharing sessions or decision making sessions, or advising.

Strategies for Student Development

Either because of the dominant bureaucratic nature of most colleges, or because of prevailing professional traditions, most strategies for student service or student development are organized along functional lines, that is, counseling services, advising services, health services, record services, financial aid services, placement services, and other special services. In some institutions, this pattern of organization and delivery strategy may be appropriate depending on particular realities of institutional or student characteristics, resource constraints, or political demands. And, certainly, as Shaffer (1980) points out, institutional constraints may determine effectiveness of student development actitivies. Some activities, such as admissions and records and financial aid may represent areas where traditional, service-oriented delivery systems are appropriate regardless of institutional type; however, insofar as developmental goals are concerned, other approaches seem better adaptable to the urban, commuter college. Determining appropriate and reasonable strategies for student development in the urban, commuter college institutional type should be guided, at least in part, by patterns of enrollment and attendance, demographic data of student age and sex, and curriculum and career choice. Enrollment and attendance patterns suggest critical points of intersection or contact between the student and institutional influence. Demographic data of student age and

sex suggest ascendent personal preoccupations dictating readiness for and appropriateness of specialized programming. Curriculum and career choice suggest perspective of intentional interventions. Maintaining the global or universal perspective adopted in the previous discussion of forms of development, certain generalized strategies for development are discussed next as illustrative of approaches not bound by functional area, but rather which require the participation of all student development professionals somewhat simultaneously for optimal execution. Furthermore, these strategies possess the common feature that all students, regardless of enrollment pattern, age or sex, or curriculum or career choice, must participate in some way.

Some may argue that some of the so-called strategies discussed below are not strategies in the sense of a separate, careful plan or method, but, instead, are normal operating necessities of a college. Certainly, that argument might be advanced regarding the first four strategies; however, this "normal operating necessity" is precisely why they are selected as "strategies." They represent conditions of normal student-institution interaction during which intentional developmental programming may occur. Recognizing the reality that, except for classroom activities, commuter institutions do not have the students held "captive" in such a way to provide ample opportunity to offer specialized programming with sufficient length and intensity to enable significant effect, it is

necessary to choose strategic footholds, or propitious moments, or normal operating necessity to accomplish the task. The absence of natural settings for student interaction may be the most important institutional constraint inhibiting intentional student development in commuter institutions. Thus, "strategies," characterized by opportunity for student-institution interaction, are suggested. The final two approaches do represent strategies in a more common sense.

Recruitment and intake. The initial period of association of student and institution represents a favorable opportunity to influence students. Normally, new students are eager, appear "ready" for information consumption, hold high expectations for themselves and the institution, and recognize that they have many more questions than answers about themselves and their world. This period should be used to help the student clarify what the college can do for them developmentally and how they can most effectively take advantage of college resources, to increase awareness in students of their developmental potential (what the college will be trying to do and what they can and should expect to happen to them), to give information organized and targeted to developmental issues, and to describe the overall experience as it will unfold from a developmental perspective.

Examples of programs tailored to the urban, commuter institution might include a stretch-eight (or four) orientation program to offer redefined "orientation" activities throughout

the entire period of enrollment. Such a program would require new thinking as to the nature of traditional orientation, targeting not just shallow information to help the student initially to navigate the system, but on understanding self, on developing new ways to relate to the world, on improving learning processes themselves, or on new views of the nature of knowledge and its place in life. Other programs might take advantage of the urban setting and channel programs through college or community outposts, satellites, urban centers, or learning centers (Reed, 1970).

Advising. This form of contact and interaction with students is pervasive and, aside from teaching, may represent the most potent tool to promote development available to professionals on commuter campuses. From early contact with the college or university to graduation from it, students seek advice. They seek it from teachers, counselors, and administrators alike as they try to benefit from the views of professionals. All forms of advising should have a developmental thrust in the sense that conscious efforts be made by advisors to give information or share opinions and views to influence student behavior, attitudes, beliefs, or values. The efforts should be deliberate and delivered by well informed and trained professionals. The college might, for example, create a mentoring system, built around the establishment of a special relationship between each student and one or more faculty

members, to guide, or possibly direct, the student to the most advantageous opportunities for growth.

Teaching. Most student service professionals are not assigned teaching responsibilities; yet, teaching by academicians is the most pervasive sanctioned activity in colleges and universities. Whether the influence through teaching is direct or indirect, it remains a target of critical strategic importance for student development professionals. They should teach, and/or work collaboratively with others, to ensure that classroom instruction is focused to affect students developmentally. Illustrations of the approach may be found in Parker (1978) including classroom efforts to promote intellectual stage movement (Widick & Simpson, 1978) and to promote career development (Knefelkamp & Slepitza, 1978).

Environmental management. It is not uncommon to find arguments in the literature that suggests that student development professionals should turn some of their talent toward organization development (Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980). This may be especially true in the urban, commuter college where direct student contact may always be limited. In such case, it is advantageous to employ strategies which might have institution-wide implications, such as normative/educational approaches to help faculty (who do work directly with students) sort out, understand, or possibly shape their own beliefs, attitudes, and values. Other environmental forces, such as the

political or economic climate, may have direct effect upon students (Simon, 1980) and, therefore, should be under continual assessment to determine effects on students and under careful guidance of skillful organization development specialists to ensure the greatest benefit to students, or at least, minimize deleterious consequences.

Developmental programming. Certain strategies of student development professionals should be planned especially to address one or more of the forms of development discussed in the previous section and to be delivered in some thoughtful and deliberate manner. Examples of specialized developmental programming might include career planning activities, weekend-type seminars addressing identity and intimacy issues, special interdisciplinary classes designed to promote stage progression in moral reasoning, workshops on career transition, seminars on life structure transitions, and value clarification sessions. One of the major obstacles to success in this strategic approach is access to students. Unlike residential environments, commuter environments often encourage students to come to campus only for class while departing immediately thereafter to reengage their other world. Thus, much developmental programming should be related or connected to regular classroom activities. Ideal conditions might reveal much collaborative activity between student service professionals and classroom teachers including, but not limted to, design and delivery of special units of

instruction, out-of-class activities which build upon and extend in-class activities, or the design and implementation of a specialized curriculum to promote development.

Development information systems. Careful examination of most educative processes reveals that information dissemination is a core activity. Whether teaching, counseling, or advising, professionals in considerable measure are involved in giving information to students. This strategy simply is intended to capitalize on this fact by establishing an active, visible information distribution system with direct links with each student. The system should communicate frequently with students on timely topics, but most importantly, should constantly target information on developmental issues. Examples of appropriate developmental issues include points of view concerning great moral dilemmas of our time, such as abortion and the nuclear threat, discussions of problems in career transition, divorce, or race relations, data associating achievement in college with achievement after college, evidence linking ethical issues to new laws, discussions of justice in society, and many, many other topics which disturb students and which might help students ease from one developmental level to another. Developmental information systems also may help "reach" some students who only attend classes irregularly or at times when contact with other students and with faculty are severely limited, such as with evening classes. Some illustrations of developmental information

systems at work might take advantage of the advising or mentoring system mentioned earlier, and catalog student activities or involvements for review and analysis. Other examples might include a career tabloid compiled and edited by instructors and student service specialists to heighten awareness of career opportunities and skills needed by students which incorporates activities to be led by classroom instructors, or a night lite newsletter published frequently and exclusively for students attending only in the evenings. A final example of developmental information systems might take the form of a computerized monitoring system designed to give current information at any time to students, and possibly to advisors as well, revealing precisely progress-to-date through the college.

No argument is presented that any of these suggested programs within generalized strategies would not necessarily be appropriate for institutions unlike the urban, commuter college. They might be. The argument is, rather, that in the commuter college, they may be necessary since traditional, service-oriented programming has severe limitations.

Student development professionals in urban, commuter colleges need not only ask what programs and activities might be logical and appropriate from a perspective of professional competence or assigned role, but what might be logical and appropriate from a perspective incorporating the selected forms of development to be promoted the selected generalized strategies

which focus institutional resource allocation. Figure 1 is presented to visualize the complex planning needed to fulfill student development programming goals.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Hallmarks of student development programming include intentionality and systematic planning. Certain characteristics of developmental programming will be discussed the following section, but here the need is to highlight the systematic, planned quality of it.

A well planned program of student development activities should be comprehensive, delimited only by prior choices of what developmentally to promote and how resources should be utilized. A planning guide, such as the one presented as Figure 1, is necessary to ensure that each generalized strategy is utilized to its optimal potential to promote each form of development. Ideally, a comprehensive program of activities to promote student development on a given campus would reveal specific, systematic, reoccurring, funded, and staffed programs in each cell of the planning guide (represented in Figure 1 as "a" through "dd"). More activities might be appropriate in some cells than in others, but some agreed upon minimum programming effort should be evident in each.

A planning guide also may serve the valuable purpose of providing data for the evaluation of overall program effectiveness. When completed, the guide should reveal areas of strength and of weakness in program delivery, or most certainly in program comprehensiveness.

Using the planning guide requires that each point of intersection, for example cell "v," be represented by intentional, programmatic effort. In the case of cell "v," faculty workshops focusing on interpersonal skills might be held to promote improved student-faculty interactions, or in the case of cell "1," timely discussions of moral dilemma (as with the Beirut massacre) might be presented offering follow-up seminars to promote student involvement. These are merely examples. The richness of an urban climate makes possibilities for program ideas almost limitless.

Developmental Programming

Previous sections of this chapter argue that development should be the major aim of our work, but have not addressed how developmental programming may differ from other types.

Student personnel professionals seem committed generally to helping others. They identify with the importance of recognizing individual differences while promoting growth of the total person. They respect maturity over immaturity, principles over rules, knowing over ignorance, good over bad, and happiness over misery. Yet, a surprising few seem to recognize what it means to

develop--changing from a lower to a higher stage. Some forget, or never knew, that promoting development means to induce conflict and dissonance into the lives of others. It means that by conscious act, others may experience pain, confusion, stress, anger, alienation, and doubt. These are the feelings of transition, of change. It is what it feels like to be between stages, if you will. It appears to be necessary, and it appears to lead to a more fully developed person, but it often hurts and professionals in the field of student development never should forget this fact. A useful discussion of this phenomena is available in Perry (1981).

The qualities of developmental programming which set it apart from other types of programming include a purpose or goal to change individuals (either their behavior, attitudes, beliefs, or values), (b) a careful (and usually theoretically based) assessment of development prior to intervention, (c) interventions focused on specific change in students, and (d) an evaluation of whether and how much change occurred in program subjects. Thus, developmental programming is systematic, is focused on developmental concerns in students, and relies on psychometric and/or clinical measuring approaches to determine type and quantity of change.

Normally, developmental programs are quite specific in nature. They tend to target a well confined population and very precise forms of development. For example, a group of students

may be identified to enroll in an interdisciplinary class intended to promote new ways of knowing and higher form of solving moral dilemmas. Or, students selected to serve on judicial boards may receive training in moral reasoning to help them find more adequate solutions when judging peers in trouble with the system. Developmental programs may, however, be broader in scope. The developmental transcipt and mentoring program discussed by Brown (1980) and Brown and DeCoster (1982) is such an example. Such a program proposes to systematize multiple strategies for promoting varied forms of development over long periods of time. Another broad approach is discussed by Fried (1981) who advocates the application of human development principles primarily through curriculum and teaching.

Summary

Beginning with a definition of student development, setting it apart from other views of student services, and a description of the urban, commuter college as a distinctive institutional type requiring special programming for its students, this chapter began by examining the validity of claims of uniqueness of students in urban, commuter colleges when viewed developmentally. Some examination of reported differential impacts on students by institutional type followed, leading to an argument that institutions can and should choose, in a priori fashion, both the forms of development in students and the generalized strategies for development to focus resource allocation which take into

account the special characteristics and constraints of a particular institution.

Selected forms of development were chosen to guide the analysis, including intellectual, moral and ethical, self, interpersonal, and career development, and were described briefly. Generalized strategies for development, including recruitment and intake, advising, teaching, environmental management, developmental programming, and developmental information systems, were described and juxtaposed with the forms of development to suggest a planning guide for intentional programming.

Finally, developmental programming was defined to distinguish it from other types. Some of the consequences of development were reviewed, followed by brief illustrations of both narrow and broad focus in programming.

Strategies for Development

Forms of Development	Recruitment and Intake	Advising	Teaching	Environmental Management	Developmental Programming	Developmental Information Systems
Intellectual	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Moral and Ethical	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
Self	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)
Interpersonal	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)
Career	(y)	(z)	(aa)	(bb)	(cc)	(dd)

Figure 1

A Planning Guide for Developmental Programming

References

Astin, A. W. Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1977.

Blaesser, W. W. Organization change and student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19, 109-118.

Borland, D. T. Organization development: A professional imperative. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Carbondale, Il.: ACPA Media, 1980, 205-228.

Brown, R. D. Student development in tomorrow's higher education: A return to the academy. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1972.

Brown, R. D. Developmental transcript mentoring: A total approach to integrating student development in the academy. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Carbondale, Il.: ACPA Media, 1980, 239-256.

Brown, R. D. & DeCoster, D. A. (Eds.) Mentoring-transcript systems for promoting student growth. New Directions for Student Services, Number 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1982.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The campus and the city: Maximizing assets and reducing liabilities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Chickering, A. W. Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1969.

Chickering, A. W. Commuting versus resident students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

Dillon, J. A. The evolution of the American urban university. Urban Education, 1980, 15, (1), 33-48.

Erikson, E. Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.

Fried, J. Education for student development. New Directions for Student Services, Number 15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Pulbishers, 1981.

Holland, J. L. Making vocational choices: A theory of careers. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice hall, 1973.

Hyde, W. The age and related demographic characteristics of students attending community colleges and four-year institutions. (Working paper Number 32 in Education Finance) Denver, Colorado: Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States, 1980.

Inhelder, B. & Piaget, J. The growth of logical thinking. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958.

Kaswarm, C. Lifespan differences between student groupings. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1982, 23 (5), 425-429.

Kitchner, K. S. Human development and the college campus: Sequences and tasks. In G. Hanson (Ed.), Measuring student development. New Directions for Student Services, Number 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1982, 17-46.

Kitchner, K. S. & King, P. M. Reflective judgment : Concepts of justification and their relationship to age and education. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 1981, 2 (2), 89-116.

Knefelkamp, L., Widick, C. & Parker, C. A. (Eds.). Applying new developmental findings. New Directions for Student Services, Number 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1978.

Knefelkamp, L. & Slepitza, R. A cognitive-developmental model of career development: An adoption of the Perry scheme. In C. A. Parker (Ed.), Encouraging development in college students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978, 135-150.

Kohlberg, L. Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive develcpmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Miller, T. K. & Prince, J. S. The future of student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1976.

Parker, C. A. (Ed.) Encouraging development in college students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.

Perry W. Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. W. Chickering and Associates, The modern American college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1981, 76-116.

Perry, W. Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Reed, B. The urban community college 1969: A study of 25 urban community college systems. Houston, Texas: Caudill, Rowlett, Scott Architects, Planners, Engineers, 1970.

Rodgers, R. F. Theories underlying student development. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Carbondale, Il.: ACPA Media, 1980, 10-95.

Shaffer, R. H. Analyzing institutional constraints upon student development activities. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Carbondale, Il.: ACPA Media, 1980, 303-312.

Simon, N. P. The changing economy and its effect on services, professionals, and students: A cautioning note. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Carbondale, Il.: ACPA Media, 1980, 165-177.

Spaights, E. Toward a definition of an urban university. Urban Education. 1980, 15 (3), 369-374.

Super, D. E. Life stages and sub-stages. Unpublished materials for seminar for guidance, counseling, and education for career development. Blacksburg, Va.: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1982.

Widick, C. & Simpson, D. Developmental concepts in college instruction. In C. A. Parker (Ed.), Encouraging development in college students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978, 27-59.

Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knefelkamp, L. Erik Erikson and psychosocial development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings. New Directions for Student Services, Number 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1978, 1-18.

Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knefelkamp, L. Arthur Chickering's vectors of development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings. New Directions for Student Services, Number 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1978, 19-34.